

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_**

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,689	11/20/2001	Earl Alexander Culham	THOLAM P167US	9026
20210	7590	09/10/2004	EXAMINER	
DAVIS & BUJOLD, P.L.L.C. FOURTH FLOOR 500 N. COMMERCIAL STREET MANCHESTER, NH 03101-1151			STORK, KYLE R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2178		

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/988,689	CULHAM, EARL ALEXANDER	
	Examiner Kyle R Stork	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 70-138 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 70-138 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 71-82,84-95 and 97 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the preliminary amendment filed November 20, 2001.
2. Claims 70-138 are pending. Claims 70, 83, 96, 98, 99, 112, 123, 125, and 126 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 101, 111, and 122 lack sufficient antecedent basis for limitations.

As per claim 101, the claim recites the limitation "the datastructure" in line 1.

As per claim 111, the claim recites the limitation "the web page" in line 1.

As per claim 122, the claim recites the limitation "the request for linking application" in lines 1-2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitations in these claims

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 71-82, 84-95, and 97 are objected to for being indefinite. The claims lack a modifying means that would allow the examiner to know exactly what is intended by each claim. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claims 98-99 and 134 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 98, the applicant claims "a method of liking web pages."

As per claim 99, the applicant claims "to enable the user to access at least one secondary web page."

As per claim 134 the applicant claims "multiple supplementary are linked" without specifying what multiple and supplementary modify.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 99-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Section 2100 of the MPEP states:

b) Nonfunctional Descriptive Material

Descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Thus, Office personnel should consider the claimed invention as a whole to determine whether the necessary functional interrelationship is provided.

Where certain types of descriptive material, such as music, literature, art, photographs and mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer. Such "descriptive material" is not a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. (Data consists of facts, which become information when they are seen in context and convey meaning to people. Computers process data without any understanding of what that data represents. Computer Dictionary 210 (Microsoft Press, 2d ed. 1994).)

The policy that precludes the patenting of nonfunctional descriptive material would be easily frustrated if the same descriptive material could be patented when claimed as an article of manufacture. For example, music is commonly sold to consumers in the format of a compact disc. In such cases, the known compact disc acts as nothing more than a carrier for nonfunctional descriptive material. The purely nonfunctional descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture.

Office personnel should be prudent in applying the foregoing guidance. Nonfunctional descriptive material may be claimed in combination with other functional descriptive multi-media material on a computer-readable medium to provide the necessary functional

and structural interrelationship to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. The presence of the claimed nonfunctional descriptive material is not necessarily determinative of nonstatutory subject matter. For example, a computer that recognizes a particular grouping of musical notes read from memory and upon recognizing that particular sequence, causes another defined series of notes to be played, defines a functional interrelationship among that data and the computing processes performed when utilizing that data, and as such is statutory because it implements a statutory process.

As per claims 99-134, a web page link fails to create a functional interrelationship as part of the stored data or as part of the computing process. The claims therefore fail to meet the requirements of U.S.C. 101, and are subsequently rejected.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351

10. Claims 70, 73, 76, 99, 102, 105, 126-127, 131, and 135 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Consulting.com, Inc.

As per independent claim 70, Consulting.com discloses a method of linking web pages, comprising the steps of:

- Associating at least one supplementary link with a primary web page (Figure 2)

- Providing means by which at least one supplementary link becomes accessible to the user to enable the user to access at least one secondary web page

(Figures 1-3: Figure 1 shows the link “Demo” which is proceeded by a “+” and a folder. By clicking on the “+” the supplementary link “Parameters” is displayed in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows a similar situation, but when the “+” before “Parameters” is clicked upon, a plurality of supplementary links are displayed, including “linkFrame”, “backgroundColor”, and “dotColor” as shown in Figure 3.)

As per dependent claim 73, Consulting.com discloses a method of linking web pages wherein at least one supplementary link is hidden and becomes accessible to the user through a user initiated command (Figures 1-3: Figure 1 shows the link “Demo” which is proceeded by a “+” and a folder. By clicking on the “+” the supplementary link “Parameters” is displayed in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows a similar situation, but when the “+” before “Parameters” is clicked upon, a plurality of supplementary links are displayed, including “linkFrame”, “backgroundColor”, and “dotColor” as shown in Figure 3.).

As per dependent claim 76, Consulting.com discloses a method of linking web pages wherein the user initiated command is accepted through an icon (Figures 1-3: Figure 1 shows the link “Demo” which is proceeded by a “+” and a folder. By clicking on the “+” the supplementary link “Parameters” is displayed in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows a similar situation, but when the “+” before “Parameters” is clicked upon, a plurality of supplementary links are displayed, including “linkFrame”, “backgroundColor”, and “dotColor” as shown in Figure 3.).

As per independent claim 99, Consulting.com discloses a web page link, comprising:

- At least one supplementary hidden link associated with a primary web page (Figure 2)
- Way by which the at least one supplementary hidden link becomes accessible to the user to enable the user to access at least one secondary web page (Figures 1-3)

As per dependent claim 102, Consulting.com discloses the web page link wherein the way by which the at least one supplementary hidden link becomes accessible to the user is through a user initiated command (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 105, Consulting.com discloses the web page link wherein the user initiated command is through an icon (Figures 1-3).

As per independent claim 126, Consulting.com discloses the web page link comprising:

- Associating at least one supplementary link with a primary web page (Figure 2)
- Way by which at least one supplementary link becomes accessible to the user to enable the user to access at least one secondary web page (Figures 1-3)

As per dependent claim 127, Consulting.com discloses the web page link wherein at least one supplementary link becomes accessible to the user through a user initiated command (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 131, Consulting.com discloses the web page link wherein the association between at least one supplementary link and the primary web

Art Unit: 2178

page is explicitly reflected as content on the primary web page (Figure 1-3: In these figures, the supplementary link is visible).

As per dependent claim 135, Consulting.com discloses the web page link wherein the association between at least one supplementary link and the primary web page is explicitly reflected as content on the primary web page (Figure 1-3).

11. Claims 96-97 and 123-124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Geilfuss, Jr. et al. (U.S. 2002/0075332).

As per independent claim 96, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method of linking web pages, comprising the steps of providing a primary web page with a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038: Here, the third party is a group of merchants).

As per dependent claim 97, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method for linking including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a new link to the primary web page, the addition of the new link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list criterion(page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062).

As per independent claim 123, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method of linking web pages, comprising the steps of providing a primary web page with a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038: Here, the third party is a group of merchants).

As per dependent claim 124, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method for linking including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a new link to the primary web page, the addition of the new link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list criterion(page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 71-72, 75, 78, 83-86, 88-89, 91, 100-101, 104, 107, 112-115, 117-118, 120, 128, and 136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and further in view of Microsoft® Excel® 2000, released in 1999.

Excel® is a spreadsheet application capable of storing data. Screenshots have been provided from the product in operation.

As per dependent claim 71, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those of claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose at least one supplementary link being stored in a data structure that is separate from the primary webpage. However, Excel®

discloses storing links in a data structure separate from the primary webpage (Figure 5: This is an example of an Excel spreadsheet containing links).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with the method of storing links independent of a primary web page of Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to display groupings of related data contained within certain Excel® spreadsheets without displaying unrelated data.

As per dependent claim 72, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations of claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the data structure being associated with the primary webpage (Figures 5-6: Figure 5, shows the data structure with the links. Figure 6 shows the primary webpage created from the links using the "Save as Webpage..." option found under the "File" menu).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the method of Consulting.com and Excel® that stores a supplementary link in a data structure separate from the primary page with the method of Excel® that associates the data structure with the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to store links in a location different from the primary page but still being able to seamlessly access the data structure. For example, this would allow a user having two servers to have one server store a plurality of primary pages while the other server stored only data. The server storing data would have each data set associated with a primary page, so that when a primary page is accessed, the primary

page server would request the associated data without the requestor of the primary page knowing that the data is received from a second server.

As per dependent claim 75, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 73, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose the user initiated command being a keystroke command code. However, Excel® discloses the method wherein the user initiated command being a keystroke command code (Keys for moving and scrolling in a worksheet or workbook, Keys for menus and toolbars, Keys for selecting data and cells, Keys to use with databases and lists).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of accessing a link through a user initiated command with the method of Excel® to accept keystroke commands, since it would have allowed a user to enter keystroke shortcuts instead of having to manually move a mouse or other point means to an icon to display hidden links.

As per dependent claim 78, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 76, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the method wherein the icon is presented on a tool bar. However, Excel® discloses displaying icons on a tool bar (Figure 7: see the items immediately below the menu bar).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of receiving user

commands in a browser through an icon with the method of displaying icons on a tool bar taught by Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to have several icons located in the same place for easier use.

As per independent claim 83, Consulting.com discloses the method of linking pages comprising the step of:

- Associating at least one supplementary link with a primary web page (Figure 2)
- At least one supplementary link providing access to at least one secondary web page (Figures 1-3)

Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose at least one supplementary link being stored in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page. However, Excel® discloses:

- Storing a link in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary webpage (Figure 5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with the method of storing links in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page of Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to display groupings of related data contained within certain Excel® spreadsheets without displaying unrelated data.

As per dependent claim 84, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 83, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com further discloses the method wherein the at least one supplementary

link being hidden to a user when the primary web page is active, until selectively accessed by a user (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 85, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 83, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the method wherein the data structure containing several supplementary links associated with the primary web page (Figures 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the method of Consulting.com and Excel® that stores a supplementary link in a data structure separate from the primary page with the method of Excel® that associates the data structure with the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to store links in a location different from the primary page but still being able to seamlessly access the data structure.

As per dependent claim 86, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 84, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com further discloses the method wherein at least one supplementary hidden link becomes accessible to the user through a user initiated command (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 88, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 86, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the limitation wherein the user initiated command is a keystroke command code (Keys for moving and scrolling in a worksheet or workbook, Keys for

menus and toolbars, Keys for selecting data and cells, Keys to use with databases and lists).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of accessing a link through a user initiated command with the method of Excel® to accept keystroke commands, since it would have allowed a user to enter keystroke shortcuts instead of having to manually move a mouse or other point means to an icon to display hidden links.

As per dependent claim 89, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 86, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com further discloses the user initiated command being through an icon (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 91, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 89, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the limitation of an icon being on a browser's tool bar (Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of accepting a user initiated command through an icon with the method of Excel® that allows an icon to be displayed on a tool bar, since it would have allowed a user to have access to all available tools in one centralized location.

As per dependent claim 100, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those of claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However,

Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose wherein at least one supplementary hidden link being stored in a data structure that is separate from the primary webpage. However, Excel® discloses storing links in a data structure separate from the primary webpage (Figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with the method of storing links independent of a primary web page of Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to display groupings of related data contained within certain Excel® spreadsheets without displaying unrelated data.

As per dependent claim 101, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations of claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the data structure being associated with the primary webpage (Figures 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the method of Consulting.com and Excel® that stores a hidden supplementary link in a data structure separate from the primary page with the method of Excel® that associates the data structure with the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to store links in a location different from the primary page but still being able to seamlessly access the data structure. For example, this would allow a user having two servers to have one server store a plurality of primary pages while the other server stored only data. The server storing data would have each data set associated with a primary page, so that when a primary page is accessed, the

primary page server would request the associated data without the requestor of the primary page knowing that the data is received from a second server.

As per dependent claim 104, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 102, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose the user initiated command being a keystroke command code. However, Excel® discloses the method wherein the user initiated command being a keystroke command code (Keys for moving and scrolling in a worksheet or workbook, Keys for menus and toolbars, Keys for selecting data and cells, Keys to use with databases and lists).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of accessing a link through a user initiated command with the method of Excel® to accept keystroke commands, since it would have allowed a user to enter keystroke shortcuts instead of having to manually move a mouse or other point means to an icon to display hidden links.

As per dependent claim 107, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 105, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the method wherein the icon is presented on a tool bar. However, Excel® discloses displaying icons on a tool bar (Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of receiving user commands in a browser through an icon with the method of displaying icons on a tool

bar taught by Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to have several icons located in the same place for easier use.

As per independent claim 112, Consulting.com discloses the web page link comprising:

- Associating at least one supplementary link with a primary web page (Figure 2)
- At least one supplementary link providing access to at least one secondary web page (Figures 1-3)

Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose at least one supplementary link being stored in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page. However, Excel® discloses:

- Storing a link in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary webpage (Figure 5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the Consulting.com's link with the link stored in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page of Excel®, since it would have allowed a user to display groupings of related data contained within certain Excel® spreadsheets without displaying unrelated data.

As per dependent claim 113, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com further discloses the link wherein at least one supplementary link being hidden to a user when the primary web page is active, until selectively accessed by a user (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 114, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the link wherein the data structure containing several supplementary links associated with the primary web page (Figures 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the link of Consulting.com and Excel® that stores a supplementary link in a data structure separate from the primary page with the method of Excel® that associates the data structure with the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to store links in a location different from the primary page but still being able to seamlessly access the data structure.

As per dependent claim 115, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 84, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com further discloses the link wherein at least one supplementary hidden link becomes accessible to the user through a user initiated command (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 117, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 115, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the limitation wherein the user initiated command is a keystroke command code (Keys for moving and scrolling in a worksheet or workbook, Keys for menus and toolbars, Keys for selecting data and cells, Keys to use with databases and lists).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's link wherein

accessing a link through a user initiated command with the method of Excel® to accept keystroke commands, since it would have allowed a user to enter keystroke shortcuts instead of having to manually move a mouse or other point means to an icon to display hidden links.

As per dependent claim 118, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 115, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com further discloses the user initiated command being through an icon (Figures 1-3).

As per dependent claim 120, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 118, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Excel® further discloses the limitation of an icon being on a browser's tool bar (Figure 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of accepting a user initiated command through an icon with the method of Excel® that allows an icon to be displayed on a tool bar, since it would have allowed a user to have access to all available tools in one centralized location.

As per dependent claim 128, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 127, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com fails to specifically disclose the user initiated command comprising one of a keystroke command and a pointer command. However, Excel® discloses the method wherein the user initiated command being a keystroke command (Keys for

moving and scrolling in a worksheet or workbook, Keys for menus and toolbars, Keys for selecting data and cells, Keys to use with databases and lists).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of accessing a link through a user initiated command with the method of Excel® to accept keystroke commands, since it would have allowed a user to enter keystroke shortcuts instead of having to manually move a mouse or other point means to an icon to display hidden links.

As per dependent claim 136, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the method wherein the association between at least one supplementary link and the primary web page is implicitly derived from a selected attribute of the primary page. However, Excel® discloses the association between at least one supplementary link and the primary web page is implicitly derived from a selected attribute of the primary web page (Figures 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of using a user initiated command to make links accessible with the method of Excel® to have the association of at least one supplementary link be implicitly derived, since it would have allowed a user to have supplementary links stored in a data structure that can be accessed by the primary web page.

14. Claims 74, 103, 130, 132-134, and 137-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and further in view of Musciano and Kennedy (HTML The Definitive Guide).

As per dependent claim 74, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com is silent on the hidden command being given through a single HTML tag. However, Musciano discloses the ability to have a single HTML tag give the hidden command (page 443, 13.2.4.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Musciano's HTML hidden attribute, since it would have allowed a user to hide links until they were requested by a user action.

As per dependent claim 103, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 102, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com is silent on the hidden command being given through a single HTML tag. However, Musciano discloses the ability to have a single HTML tag give the hidden command (page 443, 13.2.4.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Musciano's HTML hidden attribute, since it would have allowed a user to hide links until they were requested by a user action.

As per dependent claim 130, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 127, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com is silent on the hidden command being given through a single HTML tag. However, Musciano discloses the ability to have a single HTML tag give the hidden command (page 443, 13.2.4.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Musciano's HTML hidden attribute, since it would have allowed a user to hide links until they were requested by a user action.

As per dependent claim 132, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 127, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the web page link, wherein multiple supplementary links are provided with each supplementary link being linked to a point on the primary web page (page 27, section 2.7.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of allowing supplementary links to become accessible with Musciano's method of linking to a point on the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to initiate a command to view supplementary links and have all of them linked to the same point.

As per dependent claim 133, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 127, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose wherein the supplementary are linked to individual points on the primary web

page. However, Muschiano discloses linking to a point on a web page (page 27, section 2.7.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of allowing supplementary links to become accessible with Musciano's method of linking to a point on the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to initiate a command to view supplementary links and have all of them linked to the same point.

As per dependent claim 134, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 127, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose wherein the supplementary are linked to individual points on the primary web page. However, Muschiano discloses linking to individual points on a web page (page 27, section 2.7.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of allowing supplementary links to become accessible with Musciano's method of linking to a point on the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to initiate a command to view supplementary links and have all of them linked to different points.

As per dependent claim 137, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose wherein the supplementary are linked to individual points on the primary web page. However, Muschiano discloses linking to a point on a web page (page 27, section 2.7.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of allowing supplementary links to become accessible with Musciano's method of linking to a point on the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to initiate a command to view supplementary links and have all of them linked to the same points.

As per dependent claim 138, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose wherein the supplementary are linked to individual points on the primary web page. However, Muschiano discloses linking to individual points on a web page (page 27, section 2.7.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of allowing supplementary links to become accessible with Musciano's method of linking to a point on the primary page, since it would have allowed a user to initiate a command to view supplementary links and have all of them linked to different points.

15. Claim 77, 82, 106, and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and further in view of Yahoo! ([www.yahoo.com](http://www.yahoo.com), courtesy of web.archive.org).

As per dependent claim 77, Consulting.com discloses the limitation similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However, Consulting.com fails to disclose a browser search option. However, Yahoo! discloses a

browser search option ([web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/](http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/), page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with supplemental links with Yahoo!'s ability to present a browser search option, since it would have allowed a user to enter a link that he/she was looking for and quickly have the search option find it without having to manually scroll through a page to find the link.

As per dependent claim 82, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose further including a search engine that searches for items that meet a specified search criterion. However, Yahoo! discloses the method of searching for items that meet a specified search criterion

(<http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070718/www8.yahoo.com/search.html>: see the search options below the search field).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with the method of searching for items that meet certain criterion of Yahoo!, since it would have allowed a user to specify criteria and receive supplementary links meeting the criterion. For example, a user could enter a date and then the user would be presented with supplementary links from that date.

As per dependent claim 106, Consulting.com discloses the limitation similar to those in claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. However,

Consulting.com fails to disclose a browser search option. However, Yahoo! discloses a browser search option ([web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/](http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/), page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with supplemental links with Yahoo!'s ability to present a browser search option, since it would have allowed a user to enter a link that he/she was looking for and quickly have the search option find it without having to manually scroll through a page to find the link.

As per dependent claim 111, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose further including a search engine that searches for items that meet a specified search criterion. However, Yahoo! discloses the method of searching for items that meet a specified search criterion

(<http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070718/www8.yahoo.com/search.html>: see the search options below the search field).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with the method of searching for items that meet certain criterion of Yahoo!, since it would have allowed a user to specify criteria and receive hidden supplementary links meeting the criterion. For example, a user could enter a date and then the user would be presented with hidden supplementary links from that date.

16. Claims 87 and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and Excel® and further in view of Musciano and Kennedy (HTML The Definitive Guide).

As per dependent claim 87, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 86, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to specifically disclose the user initiated command being given through a single HTML tag on the primary web page. However, Musciano discloses the ability to have a single HTML tag give the hidden command (page 443, 13.2.4.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Musciano's HTML hidden attribute, since it would have allowed a user to hide links until they were requested by a user action.

As per dependent claim 116, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 115, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com and Excel® fail to specifically disclose the user initiated command being given through a single HTML tag on the primary web page. However, Musciano discloses the ability to have a single HTML tag give the hidden command (page 443, 13.2.4.2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of linking

web pages with Musciano's HTML hidden attribute, since it would have allowed a user to hide links until they were requested by a user action.

17. Claim 90, 95, and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and Excel® and further in view of Yahoo! ([www.yahoo.com](http://www.yahoo.com), courtesy of web.archive.org).

As per dependent claim 90, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 86, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose a browser search option. However, Yahoo! discloses a browser search option

([web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/](http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/), page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with supplemental links with Yahoo!'s ability to present a browser search option, since it would have allowed a user to enter a link that he/she was looking for and quickly have the search option find it without having to manually scroll through a page to find the link.

As per dependent claim 95, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitation similar to those in claim 83, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose the method further comprising a search engine that searches for hidden supplementary links that meet specified search criterion. However, Yahoo! discloses the method further comprising a search engine

that searches for items that meet specified search criterion

(<http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070718/www8.yahoo.com/search.html>).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Yahoo!'s method of searching for items, since it would have allowed a user to quickly search for and find a link on a page instead of having to scroll through a page manually searching.

As per dependent claim 119, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose a browser search option. However, Yahoo! discloses a browser search option

(<http://web.archive.org/web/19961128070641/http://www8.yahoo.com/>, page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Excel® and Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with supplemental links with Yahoo!'s ability to present a browser search option, since it would have allowed a user to enter a link that he/she was looking for and quickly have the search option find it without having to manually scroll through a page to find the link.

18. Claim 79-81 and 108-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and further in view of Geilfuss, Jr.

As per dependent claim 79, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to

disclose the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038: Here, the third party is a group of merchants).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 80, Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr. disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 79, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Geilfuss, Jr. further discloses the third party must meet a list of criterion before a new supplementary link can be added to the web page, the supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062: Here, the fee is a criterion that must be agreed upon before a link is posted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of

request linking with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of having third party requestors meet certain criteria, since it would allow a user to control the content of his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 81, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the means for searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor (page 1, paragraph 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of searching for links with a proximity of a cursor, since it would have allowed a user to link to another page without being directly over the link.

As per dependent claim 108, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a

primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 109, Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr. disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 108, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Geilfuss, Jr. further discloses the third party must meet a list of criterion before a new supplementary link can be added to the web page, the supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of request linking with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of having third party requestors meet certain criteria, since it would allow a user to control the content of his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 110, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 99, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the means for searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor (page 1, paragraph 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of searching for links with a proximity of a cursor, since it would have allowed a user to link to another page without being directly over the link.

19. Claim 92-94, 98, 121-122, and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Consulting.com and Excel® and further in view of Geilfuss, Jr. et al.

As per dependent claim 92, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 84, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 93, Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr. disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 92, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Geilfuss, Jr. further discloses the third party must meet a list of criterion before a new supplementary link can be added to the web page, the supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of request linking with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of having third party requestors meet certain criteria, since it would allow a user to control the content of his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 94, Consulting.com discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 83, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Consulting.com fails to disclose the means for searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses searching for supplementary links within a specified proximity to a cursor (page 1, paragraph 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of searching for links with a proximity of a cursor, since it would have allowed a user to link to another page without being directly over the link.

As per independent claim 98, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose a method of linking web pages comprising the steps of:

- Associating several supplementary hidden links with a primary web page, the supplementary links being stored in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page
- Providing a user initiated command by way of which supplementary hidden links becomes accessible to the user to enable the user to access selected secondary web pages

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose:

- Providing a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page (Figure 2; Figure 5)
- The request for linking application process including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page, the addition of the new supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (Figures 1-3)

Geilfuss, Jr. discloses:

- Providing a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038)
- The request for linking application process including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page, the addition of the new supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 121, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page. However, Geilfuss, Jr. discloses the method including a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a new supplementary link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

As per dependent claim 122, Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr. disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 112, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Geilfuss, Jr. further discloses the third party must meet a list of criterion before a new supplementary link can be added to the web page, the supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com and Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of

request linking with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of having third party requestors meet certain criteria, since it would allow a user to control the content of his/her web page.

As per independent claim 125, Consulting.com and Excel® disclose a web page link linking web pages comprising the steps of:

- Associating several supplementary hidden links with a primary web page, the supplementary links being stored in a data structure that is separate from content of the primary web page
- Providing a user initiated command by way of which supplementary hidden links becomes accessible to the user to enable the user to access selected secondary web pages

Consulting.com and Excel® fail to disclose:

- Providing a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page (Figure 2; Figure 5)
- The request for linking application process including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page, the addition of the new supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (Figures 1-3)

Geilfuss, Jr. discloses:

- Providing a request for linking application process whereby a third party seeks permission from an owner of the primary web page to add a supplementary

hidden link to the primary web page (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 4, paragraph 0038)

- The request for linking application process including a list of criterion which must be met before the third party can add a supplementary hidden link to the primary web page, the addition of the new supplementary link being automatically permitted upon the third party meeting the list of criterion (page 1, paragraph 0008; page 9, paragraph 0062)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Consulting.com's method of linking web pages with Geilfuss, Jr.'s method of allowing third parties to request displaying a link on a primary web page, since it would have allowed a user to control the content on his/her web page.

### ***Conclusion***

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Koppolu et al. (U.S. 6,460,058): Discloses hyperlink navigation.
- Walden et al. (U.S. 6,456,303): Discloses hidden links.
- Adams et al. (U.S. 6,237,030): Discloses extracting hyperlinks and secondary web pages.
- Guzak et al. (U.S. 5,838,319): Discloses displaying linked items in a hierarchy.

- Logan et al. (U.S. 5,761,683): Discloses techniques for changing behavior in a hypertext document.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (703) 605-1203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

  
STEPHEN S. HONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER